

**Application No.:** 10/550,297  
**Filing Date:** September 21, 2005

### **SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW**

Applicant thanks Examiner Ann Schillinger and Supervisor Thomas Sweet for their time and for the courtesies extended during the in person interview conducted on June 30, 2009. In addition to the Examiners, the interview was attended by Dr. Norman Jaffe, Yury Zhivilo, and Applicant's representatives, attorneys Daniel Hart and Cynthia Arko.

In the interview, Dr. Jaffe showed the Examiners a number of conventional bioprosthetic valves. Dr. Jaffe then showed the Examiners a naked porcine tissue valve, and demonstrated the insertion of an intraparietal reinforcement device into the naked porcine tissue valve. Dr. Jaffe also showed the Examiners a finished bioprosthetic valve comprising a number of intraparietal reinforcement devices coupled to a base ring.

The Moe and Angell references (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0023302 and U.S. Patent No. 3,983,581) were discussed, as was the basis for the obviousness rejection of independent Claim 21.

Examiners Schillinger and Sweet agreed that subject matter recited in independent Claim 21 appeared not to be obvious over the cited combination of Moe and Angell, and thus, pending further review, the present rejection of independent Claim 21 appears to have been overcome. Applicant agreed to submit a written response to the outstanding office action.